

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 16-20 and 22-24 are pending in the application.
Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following Remarks.

The Office action rejects Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 16-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Josephson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,155,423, hereinafter "Josephson") in view of Carey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,206,760), hereinafter "Carey"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 specifies, *inter alia*, the steps of:

- (d) generating bins for all remaining non-selected dimensions of the portfolio performance space;
- (e) determining a solution in each bin of the non-selected dimensions with a maximum value along the selected dimension; and
- (f) comparing the solution with the maximum value in each bin to other solutions in each bin to determine whether the other solutions are dominant solutions or dominated solutions.

Support for this novel concept of the fast dominance filter of the claimed invention can be found, for example, in Paragraphs [00171]-[00186] and Figures 10 and 11.

Josephson teaches a "classical" dominance filter that removes dominated candidates such that surviving candidates are Pareto optimal. See *col. 4, lines 36-44*. Contrary to the Office action, Josephson does not teach or suggest the particular mechanics of the dominance filter, and in particular, the mechanics of a fast dominance filter recited in Claim 1 above. The Carey reference adds nothing to overcome this shortcoming in Josephson.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that there is no mention in the applied art of at least this feature of the claimed invention. Thus, the applied art,

taken singly or in combination, does not disclose, teach or suggest at least the above-mentioned steps recited in Claim 1.

For at least this reason, Claim 1 is allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Claims 2, 6, 7, 11-13, 16-18, which depend from Claim 1, are likewise allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that there is no mention in the applied art of at least the feature of a dominance filtering portion that selects a first dimension from the at least three dimensions of the portfolio performance space, generates bins for all remaining non-selected dimensions of the portfolio performance space, determines a solution in each bin of the non-selected dimensions with a maximum value along the selected dimension, compares the solution with the maximum value in each bin to other solutions in each bin to determine whether the other solutions are dominant solutions or dominated solutions, and removes the dominated solutions from the portfolio performance space so as to result in a reduced set of solutions, as recited in independent Claim 19.

For at least this reason, Claim 19 is allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination. Claims 20 and 22-24, which depend from Claim 19, are likewise allowable over the applied art, taken singly or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Should Examiner Baird believe anything further would be desirable in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

It is believed that any additional fees due with respect to this paper have already been identified. However, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper, permission is given to charge account number 07-0868 in the name of General Electric Company.

Appl. No. 10/781,804
Response to final Office action dated December 1, 2008
Attorney Docket 141121-4

30 January 2009

Telephone: (810) 227-9077

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter J. Rashid/

Peter J. Rashid
Reg. No. 39,464